DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 191 SP 026 723

AUTHOR Rossetti, Rosemarie
TITLE Teacher Tolerance and Its Relationship to Teacher Traits and Disciplinary Effectiveness.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 49p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discipline; Personality Traits; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; Student Behavior; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This study measured vocational high school teachers' tolerance of disruptive behaviors and examined the relationships of teacher tolerance to selected teacher traits and disciplinary effectiveness ratings. Ratings were provided by the teachers, students, local supervisors and building directors. The population included 164 vocational high school teachers from two schools in western Ohio. The Teacher Reaction Profile was administered to teachers and their spouses or close friends. The Classroom Observation Checklist was used to measure frequency, bothersomeness and teacher tolerance of a specific list of classroom behaviors. A select group of teachers were observed in their classrooms in order to authenticate the tolerance measures from the instruments. An analysis of findings presents the degree of relationship between: (1) teacher tolerance to life events and measures of disciplinary effectiveness; (2) teacher tolerance of misbehavior scores as perceived by teachers, and disciplinary effectiveness ratings of supervisors; (3) teacher tolerance of misbehavior scores as perceived by students, and disciplinary effectiveness ratings; (4) teacher demographic variables and teacher tolerance scores; and (5) teacher demographic variables and disciplinary effectiveness ratings. The study data is displayed in 13 appended tables. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264191

Teacher Tolerance And Its Relationship To Teacher Traits And Disciplinary Effectiveness

By

Rosemarie Rossetti, Ph.D., C.I.H.
Vice President of Sales and Promotion
Stanford Interior Gardens, Inc.
1917 Northwest Blvd.
Columbus, Ohio 43212

SP026723

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Rossetti

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

The teaching profession is faced with a continuous problem of discipline in the classroom. As long as there are students and classroom teachers, this problem can be expected to continue. Classroom teachers will frequently name discipline as one of the major concerns in teaching, even causing some of them to leave the profession because of worries over classroom management.

Determining when and how to react to student misbehavior has perplexed teachers for centuries. The teachers' response to misbehavior was studied in this research. That is, what degree of tolerance of misbehavior does a teacher possess? How often does teacher intervention occur when misbehaviors occur? Some teachers have an intolerance to a disruptive situation, while others are very tolerant to the same disruptive act.

It is believed that each teacher possesses a threshold of tolerance. A teacher who is highly perceptive of discipline problems and chooses not to ignore the misbehavior can be said to have a low tolerance of disruptive behavior. Conversely, a teacher who is aware of disruptive events but chooses to ignore them is said to have a high tolerance of disruptive behavior.

Thompson (1976) examined the threshold of tolerance that the teacher can accept and still maintain a productive learning environment. He argued that this level cannot be predetermined, but rather is a part of a teacher's personality. Hence what may be perceived as a problem by one teacher may not be perceived as a problem by another teacher. He felt that teachers would have far fewer discipline problems simply by increasing their own tolerance levels of student behavior.

The literature tends to substantiate that the notion of teacher tolerance exists. An important phase of this study was the development of instruments to measure teacher tolerance of disruptive behavior. Tolerance

is the extent to which the teacher does not intervene into student classroom misbehavior. Currently, no other scales of measurement exist to measure teacher tolerance.

PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this study was to describe the degree of teacher tolerance of disruptive behavior of students and determine the extent to which it is related to teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience, personality (locus of control). The extent to which a teacher is an effective disciplinarian was also correlated with the measures of teacher tolerance. This study was designed to answer three major research questions.

1. To what extent do vocational high school teachers vary in the degree of teacher tolerance as measured by the Teacher Reaction Profile and the Classroom Observation Checklist?
2. To what extent are the measures of teacher tolerance related to classroom disciplinary effectiveness as perceived by the director of the school, the supervisor of the teacher, the students and the teacher?
3. To what extent is teacher tolerance related to teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience and locus of control?

METHODOLOGY

Population

The population used for this study was purposely selected to include all teachers at two vocational schools. These schools are located in the western portion of Ohio. The study was conducted during the months of January - April 1982. There were 164 teachers, 153 spouses or close friends of the teachers, 2,888 students in grades eleven and twelve, 4 directors and 9 supervisors who participated in the study.

Pilot Test

Samples of all instruments, developed by the researcher, were sent to a four member panel of experts to determine face validity. Needed changes were made before being pilot tested.

The instruments were pilot tested at the Delaware Joint Vocational School in Delaware, Ohio. The population for the pilot test included 11 volunteer vocational instructors. One hundred fifty-five students, one director and three supervisors also participated. Reliability for the newly developed instruments was determined. Revisions were made in the instruments as needed in order to increase the reliability.

Procedures

After the pilot study was completed, individual, personal, tape-recorded interviews were conducted with each director of the two vocational schools and all supervisors at the two schools. The purpose of conducting the tape recorded interviews was to have the administrators place their staff which they directly supervise in one of the three following disciplinary effectiveness categories: top one-third (among the best in discipline), middle one-third (about average in discipline), lower one-third (below average in discipline). These ratings were based on the opinion of the administrators, comparing each teacher's disciplinary effectiveness to all other teachers that he/she had ever supervised. The Q-sort method was utilized with the administrators. Individually they were presented a stack of cards with the name of each teacher they directly supervised on a separate card. They were asked to place each teacher into one of the three disciplinary effectiveness rating categories. They were also told to place no more than two-thirds of their teachers in any one category. This was done to insure variability in the distribution among categories. As the Q-sort proceeded, the interviewer

interrupted the administrator in order to ask certain questions concerning the placement ratings. Questions were asked about the characteristics of teachers in each of the three categories. This procedure was utilized to help the administrators establish a clear and publicly stated frame of reference that would be used in guiding their decisions. By using this procedure, the researcher was also able to make comparisons among ratings by administrators. Characteristics of teachers in each of the three categories were identified, for comparison purposes. The administrators were also asked to comment on their perceptions of the teachers' disciplinary effectiveness in the laboratory setting versus the related classroom setting. This was asked in order to determine the perceptions of the administrators concerning the setting of the teacher (lab or classroom) as they made their disciplinary effectiveness ratings. It also served to describe the opinions of the administrators with reference to the teachers' ability to handle discipline problems.

After the interviews and Q-sort was completed, all teachers in the population were given a copy of the instrument package. The packet requested demographic data (teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience), a self rating of disciplinary effectiveness, Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control (personality measure), Teacher Reaction Profile, and Classroom Observation Checklist. Also included was a copy of the Teacher Reaction Profile for the teachers' spouse or close friend to complete and return in the mail.

The Teacher Reaction Profile contained a list of 32 events which commonly occur in life, that tend to bother a person. The instrument served as one measure of tolerance. The Classroom Observation Checklist contained a list of 27 common classroom misbehaviors. Three scales were included on this instrument. The first served to measure the perceived frequency of each

misbehavior. The second scale served to assess to what degree the teacher was bothered by the misbehavior. The third scale measured the level of tolerance (degree of intervention) the teacher possessed when the misbehavior occurred. Students were also given a copy of the Classroom Observation Checklist to complete and were asked to rate their teacher's disciplinary effectiveness. A copy of the Classroom Observation Checklist is included with this report.

After all teacher and student instruments were collected, a randomly selected group of ten teachers at each of the two schools were observed while teaching in the related classroom. Teacher observations were made by the researcher for two consecutive days. The class periods observed were approximately forty-five minutes in length. A classroom observation instrument was used in order to record all misbehaviors and the teachers' reactions to the misbehaviors. The observation provided a check as to the authenticity of teacher and student reported data from the Classroom Observation Checklist. The observer had no knowledge of tolerance scores from the instruments, prior to the observation sessions. Each teacher was interviewed after the second day of observation in order to discover if the observer's presence in the classroom had a reactive effect on the teacher or students. The teachers were also asked in the interview to rate their level of tolerance of disruptive behavior, and to comment on the observation field notes.

FINDINGS

Description of Teachers

Of the 164 teachers in the population, 108 were from School B, while 56 were from School A. Teachers' ages ranged from 21 to 62, with an average age of 42 years. Sixty-two percent of the population were male teachers, while thirty-eight percent were female. The range of years of teaching experience

was from 1 to 30 years, with an average of 7.76 years. Teachers' personalities, as measured by Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, ranged from 1 to 16, with the average score being 7.65. The scale has a possible range of 1 to 23, with higher scores indicating that a person has an external locus of control, that is, one who believes in luck, chance, fate or destiny. One with a lower score is determined to have an internal locus of control. People with an internal personality believe that their own skill determines their destiny. Scores are interpreted only for group data and cannot be used to diagnose an individual. Table 1 contains the locus of control scores for teachers in the study.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Teachers' Tolerance to Life Events

Teachers were asked to indicate their tolerance to a list of 28 commonly occurring life events. The reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha for the instrument with four items deleted which were originally used in the pilot study. Deletion of these items was based on the reliability coefficients on the original instrument. The newly constructed instrument had a reliability of .85 for the remaining 28 items. The identical questionnaire was utilized to measure teacher tolerance as perceived by the teachers' spouse or close friend. The same 28 items produced a reliability coefficient of .97 for the spouse/close friend ratings.

Table 2 shows the distribution of teacher scores as they rated their own tolerance to life events.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

The range was from 43 to 103, with a midpoint of 73, indicating that teachers rated themselves below the midpoint with a mean score of 67.16. The range of

scores could have been from 28 to 112. Responses were on a four point scale, with a 1 indicating the teacher was extremely tolerant.

Table 3 presents the distribution of tolerance scores for the teachers in the study as reported by their spouses or close friend. Eleven spouses/close friends did not respond to the instrument.

(Insert Table 3 about here)

The range was from 30 to 106, with a mean score of 63.08 which is below the midpoint of 70. The range of scores could have been from 28 to 112.

When comparing the spouse/close friend ratings with teachers' self ratings, teachers were evaluated as being somewhat more tolerant by the teachers' spouse/close friend than by themselves. The degree of relationship between the two groups of raters was r = .36.

Teachers' Tolerance to Classroom Misbehavior

An additional instrument was utilized to measure teacher tolerance. The Classroom Observation Checklist was designed to measure a teacher's tolerance to specific classroom misbehaviors. A list of 27 commonly occurring misbehaviors was provided. The teachers rated each behavior based on the frequency with which it occurred in their class, how bothered they were when it occurred and how tolerant they were of it. The reliability for the frequency scale was .89, for the bothersomeness scale .93 and for the tolerance scale .90, when completed by the teachers.

The same instrument was also given to all vocational students in the study. They rated the misbehaviors for their vocational programs. The teachers' reactions to the misbehavior was rated according to students perceptions. The reliability for the student version of this instrument was .93 for the frequency scale, .91 for the bothersomeness scale and .94 for the

tolerance scale.

In order to compute scores on the four point scale, it was determined that if a misbehavior did not occur, and was coded a 1, the remaining two scales would be coded as missing data. It was determined by the researcher that if a misbehavior did not occur in the classroom, the teacher could not be bothered by it or tolerate, or fail to tolerate it.

Table 4 contains the mean scores and rank orders for the 27 misbehaviors. The misbehaviors are listed in rank order of frequency as rated by the teachers. The most frequent misbehavior, as reported by the teachers, was bothering other students by talking. Students felt that this misbehavior was third in frequency.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

The misbehavior that most bothered the teacher was vandalism to school property. This misbehavior was also least tolerated by the teachers.

Table 5 reveals the teacher scores on the Classroom Observation Checklist as perceived by teachers. The mean score was 3.26 which indicates that teachers were seldom tolerant of misbehaviors and usually intervened. The range of scores was from 2.33 to 4.00.

(Insert Table 5 about here)

Table 6 shows the teacher tolerance scores to misbehaviors as perceived by students. The range of scores was from 2.3 to 3.58, with a mean score of 2.96.

(Insert Table 6 about here)

The classroom observations supported the teacher tolerance scores in 50% of

the cases, that is, in ten of the twenty cases the scores ranged in a tolerance category that matched the opinion of the observer. In the remaining 50% of the cases, the teacher seemed either more or less tolerant of misbehaviors to the observer than the scores that were reported from students and the teachers indicated.

Disciplinary Effectiveness Ratings

Each teacher was evaluated by the school director, supervisor, students and him/herself as to the disciplinary effectiveness of the teacher. Director and supervisor ratings were made during a tape-recorded Q-sort interview. Each teacher was placed into one of three categories: top one-third (among the best disciplinarians), middle one-third (about average in disciplinary effectiveness), lower one-third (below average in disciplinary effectiveness) by each director, supervisor, student, and they also rated themselves.

Table 7 shows the breakdown by categories, of the disciplinary effectiveness ratings made by directors. More teachers were judged to be in the middle one-third category, (47.6%) with a mean score of 1.71.

(Insert Table 7 about here)

Supervisor ratings of teacher disciplinary effectiveness are revealed in Table 8. Again, more teachers were placed in the middle one-third category (42.1%).

(Insert Table 8 about here)

The mean score was 1.77 which is comparable to the mean score of 1.71 given by the directors.

Table 9 shows the teachers' self-ratings of their disciplinary effectiveness. In comparison to administrators' ratings, teachers judged

themselves to be more disciplinary effective.

(Insert Table 9 about here)

Teachers gave themselves a mean rating of 1.59, compared to the administrators' rating of 1.77 for supervisors and 1.71 for directors. The majority of the teachers (51.2%) placed themselves in the middle one-third category.

In comparison, Table 10 shows the disciplinary effectiveness ratings of teachers as provided by their students. They ranked their teachers as slightly less effective than did the teachers, but more effective than did the supervisors or directors.

(Insert Table 10 about here)

Student ratings were calculated as a class average. The mean number of students per class was 17.6 students. The mean rating by students of their teachers' disciplinary effectiveness was 1.63, which is in the middle one-third category.

Relationship of Tolerance Measures to Disciplinary Effectiveness Ratings

In order to describe relationships between multiple measures of teacher tolerance and the various disciplinary effectiveness ratings, simple correlation coefficients were calculated.

Table 11 contains the relationships between each of the four tolerance measures and each of the four disciplinary effectiveness ratings.

(Insert Table 11 about here)

The relationships between teacher tolerance of life events as perceived by the teachers' spouse/close friend and the four ratings of disciplinary

effectiveness were low. Correlations of r = -.04, r = .07, r = -.07 and r = -.00 were found for relationships with supervisor, director, teacher and student ratings respectively for the combined schools. Low relationships were also found between teachers' tolerance to life events as perceived by teachers and the various ratings of disciplinary effectiveness. Correlations of r = -.02, r = .12, r = -.08 and r = -.12 were found when supervisor, director, teacher and student ratings respectively were correlated with each other for both schools combined.

Low, negative correlations were found between teacher tolerance of classroom misbehavior as perceived by the teachers and ratings of disciplinary effectiveness. The highest correlations were found with teacher tolerance of classroom misbehavior and the teacher self-rating of disciplinary effectiveness (r = -.23), and student ratings of disciplinary effectiveness (r = -.21). This negative correlation indicates that the teacher who scored higher (more intolerant) on the tolerance scale of the Classroom Observation Checklist was rated as being a more effective disciplinarian by the students and by the teachers themselves than was the teacher who scored lower (more tolerant).

Moderate to substantial negative correlations were calculated between the teachers' tolerance to classroom misbehaviors as perceived by the students and ratings of disciplinary effectiveness. The correlations between teacher tolerance of classroom misbehavior and disciplinary effectiveness as rated by the students was calculated for School A to be r = -.61, for School B, r = -.57, and for the total teacher population, r = -.59. The correlations between teacher tolerance of classroom misbehavior as perceived by the students and disciplinary effectiveness as rated by the teachers was found to be r = -.29, as rated by the director, r = -.25, and as rated by the supervisor, r = -.30. This negative correlational trend indicates that the

teacher judged to be more intolerant was also judged to be a more effective disciplinarian.

Relationships of Demographic Variables with Teacher Tolerance Measures

Correlations were calculated between the demographic variables: teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience and locus of control (a personality measure) and each of the measures of teacher tolerance.

Table 12 illustrates very slight correlations between a teachers' age and their measures of tolerance.

(Insert Table 12 about here)

A correlation of r = -.16 was found between age and teachers' tolerance to life events, as perceived by the teachers' spouse/close friend. A correlation of r = -.11 was found between age and teachers' tolerance to misbehavior, as perceived by the students. This indicates that the older teachers tended to be more tolerant of classroom misbehaviors and did not intervene as often as would a younger teacher.

The correlations between teachers' sex and measures of teacher tolerance show slight to moderate relationships. The relationship between teachers' tolerance to misbehavior as perceived by the teacher and the teachers' sex was r = -.27. This indicates that female teachers tended to be more tolerant to misbehaviors. In contrast, the relationship between teachers' tolerance to misbehavior as perceived by the students and the teachers' sex was r = .26 which shows that female teachers tended to be more intolerant from the students' viewpoint.

The relationships between years of teaching and various measures of teacher tolerance were quite low. The highest correlation of r = .10 was found between years of teaching experience and teachers' tolerance to life

events as perceived by the teacher. This indicates a very slight trend showing that the teacher with more years of teaching experience is less tolerant of events happening in one's life.

The relationships between locus of control scores and measures of teacher tolerance were low. A teacher with an external locus of control was slightly less tolerant of life events as perceived by the teachers' spouse/close friend than the teacher with an internal locus of control. A correlation of $r = .29$ shows the strength of this association. However, a teacher with an external locus of control was slightly more tolerant of classroom misbehaviors, as perceived by the teacher, than a teacher with an internal locus of control. The strength of this association is $r = -.19$.

Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Disciplinary Effectiveness

Relationships were determined between demographic variables and disciplinary effectiveness ratings as a point of interest, rather than being a major research question to be answered. It seemed logical to explore this relationship directly since relationships between demographic variables and tolerance measures had been determined and relationships between tolerance measures and disciplinary effectiveness had been discovered.

Table 13 illustrates the relationships between the four demographic variables and ratings of disciplinary effectiveness. The relationship of teachers' age to disciplinary effectiveness ratings were negligible to low with $r = -.02$ with supervisors' ratings, $r = .02$ with directors' ratings, $r = -.11$ with teachers' self ratings and $r = -.04$ with students' ratings.

(Insert Table 13 about here)

Association of teachers' sex with ratings of disciplinary effectiveness ratings were negligible to low. The relationships of teachers' sex $r = -.12$

with supervisors' ratings, r = -.15 with directors' ratings, r = -.01 with teachers' self ratings and r = -.02 with students' ratings were found. This indicates a very slight tendency for female teachers to be rated as the best disciplinarians.

Relationships of teachers' years of teaching experience and ratings of disciplinary effectiveness reveal low associations with r = -.21 with supervisors' ratings, r = -.17 with directors' ratings, r = -.25 with teachers' self ratings and r = -.12 with students' ratings. This slight trend shows that the teachers with more years of teaching experience were rated as the best disciplinarians.

Relationships of teachers' locus of control scores with disciplinary effectiveness ratings were negligible in association, with r = .02 with supervisors' ratings, r = -.02 with directors' ratings, r = .05 with teachers' self rating and r = -.04 with students' ratings.

CONCLUSIONS

1. There are no strong relationships between teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience, or locus of control and measures of teacher tolerance. That is, one cannot very accurately explain a teacher's tolerance of disruptive behavior based on the teachers' age, sex, years of teaching experience or locus of control.
2. One cannot very thoroughly explain teachers' level of disciplinary effectiveness based on teachers' tolerance to life event's scores.
3. One can determine, to a moderate degree, a teacher's effectiveness as a disciplinarian based on teachers' tolerance to misbehavior scores. Those who are intolerant of misbehaviors will tend to be rated as the better disciplinarians.

4. Knowing a teacher's age, sex, years of teaching experience and locus of control will not allow one to determine the teacher's level of disciplinary effectiveness.
5. Some behaviors: students bothering others by talking, whispering, and students coming to class unprepared, are perceived by the teachers to be the most frequent misbehaviors. Teachers report some misbehaviors (vandalism and fighting) to be the most bothersome and the least tolerated classroom disturbances.
6. The fact that a misbehavior occurs frequently does not necessarily mean that it bothers a teacher nor that it will not be tolerated by a teacher.
7. A misbehavior that is perceived by a teacher to be bothersome is likely to also be perceived as intolerable.
8. Administrators consider teachers who are consistent, stern, just, fair, well-organized, prepared, demand respect, establish good rapport, are business-like, are active professionals, assertive and personable to be effective disciplinarians.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings related to teacher tolerance of disruptive behavior the following recommendations are offered.

1. Teachers should be made more aware of their individual level of tolerance to disruptive behaviors. They should know which misbehaviors are more frequent, which are bothersome and which they will not tolerate. It is recommended that a supervisor assist the teacher in monitoring these awareness levels. This will alert the teacher to the misbehaviors that recur, and that cause an inner feeling of bothersomeness. It will also

allow the teacher to see if the teacher reactions put an end to the misbehavior.

2. Teachers should be more sensitive to their feelings of bothersomeness when misbehaviors occur, to determine if the misbehavior provoking this feeling is frequently occurring, and to determine if the misbehavior is tolerated or allowed to recur.
3. Additional validation of tolerance instruments can be accomplished by conducting further research on two selected groups of teachers who were judged to be tolerant and intolerant. Raters could include the teachers themselves, the administrators and the other teachers on the faculty.
4. Further research should be directed to investigate relationships between teacher tolerance and patterns of teacher preparation. One should explore the differences in teachers prepared to teach in standard four year college, teacher education programs (B.S. Degree), and programs which prepare persons who come into teaching directly from an industry position (perhaps with no college education). One should also explore the relationships of teacher patterns of preparation with disciplinary effectiveness ratings. Justification for this research is derived from comments made from administrators during the Q-sort interviews, regarding differences detected in teachers prepared in these two major fashions.
5. Additional investigation should explore the differences in frequency of misbehavior, bothersomeness levels and tolerance levels of teachers in vocational high schools versus traditional academic high schools. One should also compare disciplinary effectiveness ratings between the two types of schools.
6. A similar study should be conducted at the grade school level to make comparisons in the frequencies of misbehaviors, teachers' bothersomeness

and tolerance ratings. One could explore if high school misbehaviors were an extension of grade school misconduct.

7. More research is needed in order to discover teacher demographic variables that correlate with teacher tolerance. Variables to consider include teachers' marital status, class size, additional personality traits, and number of children in the family in which the teacher was raised.

8. More intense classroom observation schedules should be designed in future research in order to investigate what behaviors are most frequent, bothersome and tolerated. Additional links and patterns to teacher tolerance could be explored. This observation schedule is needed to further validate the Classroom Observation Checklist instrument used in this study. One could determine if the most bothersome misbehaviors were those that were most frequent or those that recurred after teacher reaction and continued to be noted by the teacher as a misbehavior.

9. More research is needed to discover if changes in teacher tolerance occur in patterns, based upon the time of day, day of the week, or week in the school year. This study would need to be an ongoing and long-term project. Evidence has been made by Lawrence, Steed, Young (1978), in the literature, on changes in behaviors of teachers and students depending on the day of the week, to substantiate further investigation.

10. More research concerning whether certain students are tolerated more readily as they misbehave is needed. Hargreaves (1975) is cited in the literature as claiming that older boys are not corrected as frequently as are other misbehaving students, in teachers' fear of retaliation from the older boys.

TABLE 1

LOCUS OF CONTROL SCORES OF TEACHERS

Scores*	School A		School B		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	1	1.8	4	3.7	5	3.0
2	3	5.4	6	5.6	9	5.5
3	2	3.6	11	10.2	13	7.9
4	6	10.7	6	5.6	12	7.3
5	3	5.4	10	9.3	13	7.9
6	4	7.1	9	8.3	13	7.9
7	11	19.6	8	7.4	19	11.6
8	8	14.2	6	5.6	14	8.5
9	0	0	15	13.9	15	9.1
10	2	3.6	8	7.4	10	6.2
11	6	10.7	5	4.6	11	6.7
12	2	3.6	8	7.4	10	6.2
13	3	5.4	4	3.7	7	4.3
14	4	7.1	4	3.7	8	4.9
15	1	1.8	2	1.8	3	1.8
16	0	0	2	1.8	2	1.2
Totals	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%
$\bar{X}$	7.80		7.57		7.65	
Mdn	7.32		7.50		7.40	
Mode	7.00		9.00		7.00	
Range	14.00		15.00		15.00	
s	3.61		3.85		3.76	

*Higher scores indicate a more external locus of control.

Possible scores range from 1 to 23.

TABLE 2

TOLERANCE TO LIFE EVENTS SCORES AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Score*	School A n	School A %	School B n	School B %	Total n	Total %	Cumulative Percent School A	Cumulative Percent School B	Cumulative Percent Total
101 - 106	0	0	1	.9	1	.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
95 - 100	0	0	1	.9	1	.6	100.0	99.1	99.4
89 - 94	0	0	2	1.8	2	1.2	100.0	98.1	98.8
83 - 88	1	1.8	2	1.8	3	1.8	100.0	96.3	97.6
77 - 82	4	7.1	4	3.7	8	4.9	98.2	94.4	95.7
71 - 76	12	21.5	26	24.1	38	23.2	91.1	90.7	90.9
65 - 70	17	30.3	33	30.5	50	30.5	69.6	66.7	67.7
59 - 64	12	21.4	26	24.2	38	23.2	39.3	36.1	37.2
53 - 58	8	14.3	10	9.4	18	11.0	17.9	12.0	14.0
47 - 52	0	0	2	1.8	2	1.2	3.6	2.8	3.0
41 - 46	2	3.6	1	.9	3	1.8	3.6	.9	1.8
35 - 40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
29 - 34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	66.09		67.71		67.16				
Mdn	66.50		66.83		66.70				
Mode	58.00		64.00		69.00				
s	7.83		9.04		8.65				

*A 28 item scale with response set 1-4
1 = Extremely Tolerant 2 = Usually Tolerant 3 = Rarely Tolerant 4 = Never Tolerant
Scores can range from 28-112.

TABLE 3

TOLERANCE TO LIFE EVENTS SCORES AS PERCEIVED BY SPOUSES/CLOSE FRIENDS

Scores*	School A n	School A Adjusted %	School B n	School B Adjusted %	Total n	Total Adjusted %	Cumulative Percent School A	Cumulative Percent School B	Cumulative Percent Total
101 - 106	0	0	1	1.0	1	0.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
95 - 100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0
89 - 94	0	0	2	2.0	2	1.3	100.0	99.0	99.3
83 - 88	0	0	4	4.0	4	2.6	100.0	97.0	98.0
77 - 82	3	5.6	4	4.0	7	4.6	100.0	92.9	95.4
71 - 76	5	9.3	14	14.1	19	12.4	94.4	88.9	90.8
65 - 70	12	22.2	18	18.3	30	19.6	85.2	74.7	78.4
59 - 64	20	37.0	28	28.3	48	31.4	63.0	56.6	58.8
53 - 58	8	14.8	12	12.1	20	13.1	25.9	28.3	27.5
47 - 52	5	9.3	6	6.1	11	7.2	11.1	16.2	14.4
41 - 46	1	1.8	8	8.1	9	5.8	1.9	10.1	7.2
35 - 40	0	0	1	1.0	1	0.7	0	2.0	1.3
29 - 34	0	0	1	1.0	1	0.7	0	1.0	0.7
TOTAL	54	100%	99	100%	153	100%			
$\bar{X}$	62.15		63.59		63.08				
Mdn	62.50		63.20		62.85				
Mode	63.00		60.00		63.00				
s	8.13		12.22		10.95				

*A 28 item scale with response set 1-4
1 = Extremely Tolerant 2 = Usually Tolerant 3 = Rarely Tolerant 4 = Never Tolerant
Scores can range from 28-112.

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY, BOTHERSOMENESS AND TOLERANCE OF CLASSROOM MISBEHAVIORS AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS AND STUDENTS*

	Frequency				Bothersomeness				Tolerance			
	Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated	
Misbehaviors	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Bothering Other Students by Talking	2.82	1	2.83	3	3.27	17	3.15	7	3.09	16	3.00	10
Students Whispering	2.77	2	2.84	2	2.77	24	2.71	21	2.78	21	2.68	19
Students Unprepared for Class	2.71	3	2.58	5	3.24	18	2.90	16	3.12	15	2.81	15
Not Following Instructions	2.67	4	2.36	12	3.34	14	3.07	9	3.24	12	3.04	8
Inattentiveness	2.64	5	2.56	6	3.11	20	2.85	18	2.97	19	2.78	16
Student Indifference	2.60	6	2.40	11	3.34	14	2.99	13	2.96	20	2.87	13
Clowning/Foolish Behavior	2.58	7	2.91	1	2.99	23	2.97	15	2.96	20	2.91	12
Not Doing Task	2.57	8	2.53	8	3.28	16	3.03	11	3.15	14	2.92	11
Idleness	2.56	9	2.51	9	3.40	12	3.19	4	3.36	10	3.17	4
Shouting Out Answers in Class	2.48	10	2.55	7	2.71	25	2.56	23	2.70	22	2.53	21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4 (Continued)

Misbehaviors	Frequency				Bothersomeness				Tolerance			
	Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Tardiness to Class	2.43	11	2.53	8	3.31	15	3.03	11	3.50	6	3.06	6
Disrespect of Other Students	2.34	12	2.44	10	3.46	9	2.97	15	3.31	11	2.91	12
Littering	2.22	13	2.10	16	3.39	13	3.02	12	3.45	7	3.06	6
Profanity	2.22	13	2.60	4	3.42	11	2.98	14	3.43	8	2.87	13
Inactive Disobedience	2.19	14	1.98	19	3.50	8	3.08	8	3.40	9	3.02	9
Making Disruptive Noises	2.17	15	2.27	13	3.09	21	2.88	17	3.05	18	2.82	14
Abusing Privileges	2.16	16	2.01	18	3.43	10	3.06	10	3.45	7	3.05	7
Cheating in Class	2.08	17	1.94	21	3.70	3	3.26	3	3.62	4	3.23	3
Lying	2.06	18	1.96	20	3.57	7	3.08	8	3.43	8	3.00	10
Drinking or Eating Food in Class	2.03	19	2.19	15	3.06	22	2.76	20	3.16	13	2.77	17
Walking Around the Classroom without Permission	1.97	20	2.20	14	3.12	19	2.64	22	3.16	13	2.67	20
Disrespect of Teacher	1.92	21	2.03	17	3.61	6	3.16	6	3.45	7	3.05	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4 (Continued)

Misbehaviors	Frequency				Bothersomeness				Tolerance			
	Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated		Teacher Rated		Student Rated	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Active Disobedience	1.85	22	1.87	23	3.69	4	3.06	10	3.66	3	3.02	9
Leaving Class without Permission	1.73	23	1.83	24	3.64	5	3.17	5	3.61	5	3.12	5
Mocking a Teacher	1.68	24	1.89	22	3.12	19	2.79	19	3.07	17	2.74	18
Vandalism to School Property	1.67	25	1.65	26	3.90	1	3.43	1	3.91	1	3.43	1
Fighting	1.62	26	1.80	25	3.74	2	3.29	2	3.72	2	3.28	2
Grand Mean	2.25		2.27		3.34		3.00		3.29		2.96	

*A 27 item scale with response set 1-4.

Frequency

1 = Has never occurred
2 = Has occurred once or twice but no more
3 = Recurs with occasional frequency
4 = Has become almost habitual

Bothersomeness

1 = Does not bother at all
2 = Seldom bothers
3 = Usually bothers
4 = Bothers each time it occurs

Tolerance

1 = Always tolerates and never intervenes
2 = Usually tolerates and rarely intervenes
3 = Seldom tolerates and usually intervenes
4 = Never tolerates and always intervenes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

LEVEL OF TEACHER TOLERANCE FOR CLASSROOM MISBEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Score*	School A n	School A %	School B n	School B %	Total n	Total %	Cumulative Percent School A	Cumulative Percent School B	Cumulative Percent Total
3.75 - 4.00	5	8.9	9	8.3	14	8.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
3.50 - 3.74	9	16.1	22	20.4	31	18.9	91.1	91.7	91.5
3.25 - 3.49	14	25.0	30	27.8	44	26.8	75.0	71.3	72.6
3.00 - 3.24	15	26.8	28	25.9	43	26.3	50.0	43.5	45.7
2.75 - 2.99	9	16.1	10	9.3	19	11.6	23.2	17.6	19.5
2.50 - 2.74	4	7.1	5	4.6	9	5.5	7.1	8.3	7.9
2.25 - 2.49	0	0	4	3.7	4	2.4	0	3.7	2.4
TOTALS	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	3.23		3.28		3.26				
Mdn	3.22		3.32		3.27				
Mode	3.00		3.00		3.00				
s	0.36		0.35		0.35				

*A 27 item scale with response set 1-4.
1 = Always tolerates; never intervenes
2 = Usually tolerates; rarely intervenes
3 = Seldom tolerates; usually intervenes
4 = Never tolerates; always intervenes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6

LEVEL OF TEACHER TOLERANCE FOR CLASSROOM MISBEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS

Scores*	School A		School B		Total		Cumulative Percent		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	School A	School B	Total
3.75 - 4.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3.50 - 3.74	1	1.8	2	1.9	3	1.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
3.25 - 3.49	2	3.6	9	8.3	11	6.7	98.2	98.1	98.2
3.00 - 3.24	21	37.4	40	37.0	61	37.2	94.6	89.8	91.5
2.75 - 2.99	22	39.3	39	36.1	61	37.2	57.1	52.8	54.3
2.50 - 2.74	8	14.3	15	13.9	23	14.0	17.9	16.7	17.1
2.25 - 2.49	2	3.6	3	2.8	5	3.1	3.6	2.8	3.0
TOTALS	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	2.93		2.97		2.96				
Mdn	2.93		2.97		2.97				
Mode	2.89		2.88		2.89				
s	0.24		0.23		0.23				

*A 27 item scale with response set 1-4.
1 = Always tolerates; never intervenes
2 = Usually tolerates; rarely intervenes
3 = Seldom tolerates; usually intervenes
4 = Never tolerates; always intervenes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 7

DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS

Disciplinary Effectiveness Ratings	School A		School B		Total		Cumulative Percent		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	School A	School B	Total
1 (Top one-third)	25	44.6	42	38.9	67	40.9	44.6	38.9	40.9
2 (Middle one-third)	30	53.6	48	44.4	78	47.6	98.2	83.3	88.4
3 (Lowest one-third)	1	1.8	18	16.7	19	11.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTALS	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	1.57		1.78		1.71				
Mdn	1.60		1.75		1.69				
Mode	2.00		2.00		2.00				
s	0.54		0.72		0.66				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 8

SUPERVISORS' RATINGS OF TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS

Disciplinary Effectiveness Ratings	School A		School B		Total		Cumulative Percent		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	School A	School B	Total
1 (Top one-third)	19	33.9	47	43.5	66	40.2	33.9	43.5	40.2
2 (Middle one-third)	24	42.9	45	41.7	69	42.1	76.8	85.2	82.3
3 (Lowest one-third)	13	23.2	16	14.8	29	17.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTALS	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	1.89		1.71		1.77				
Mdn	1.88		1.66		1.73				
Mode	2.00		1.00		2.00				
s	0.76		0.71		0.73				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9

TEACHERS' SELF RATINGS OF DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS

Disciplinary Effectiveness Ratings	School A		School B		Total		Cumulative Percent		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	School A	School B	Total
1 (Top one-third)	21	37.5	53	49.1	74	45.1	37.5	49.1	45.1
2 (Middle one-third)	30	53.6	54	50.0	84	51.2	91.1	99.1	96.3
3 (Lowest one-third)	5	8.9	1	0.9	6	3.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTALS	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	1.71		1.52		1.59				
Mdn	1.73		1.52		1.60				
Mode	2.00		2.00		2.00				
s	0.62		0.52		0.56				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 10

STUDENTS' RATINGS OF TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS

Disciplinary Effectiveness* Ratings	School A		School B		Total		Cumulative Percent		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	School A	School B	Total
1.00 - 1.49	16	28.5	44	40.7	60	36.4	28.6	40.7	36.6
1.50 - 1.99	26	46.6	49	45.4	75	45.5	75.0	86.1	82.3
2.00 - 2.49	12	21.4	15	13.9	27	16.6	96.4	100.0	98.8
2.50 - 2.99	2	3.5	0	0	2	1.5	100.0	0	100.0
TOTAL	56	100%	108	100%	164	100%			
$\bar{X}$	1.73		1.58		1.63				
Mdn.	1.72		1.59		1.61				
Mode	2.00		2.00		2.00				
s	0.35		0.31		0.33				

*1 = Judged to be in the top one-third in disciplinary effectiveness
2 = Judged to be in the middle one-third in disciplinary effectiveness
3 = Judged to be in the lowest one-third in disciplinary effectiveness

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER TOLERANCE MEASURES AND DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS*

Measures of Tolerance	Raters											
	Supervisor			Director			Teacher			Student		
	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total
To Life Events (by spouse/close friend)	-.15	.02	-.04	.02	.08	.07	-.02	-.09	-.07	.09	-.01	-.00
To Life Events (by teacher)	-.24	.11	-.02	-.03	.15	.12	-.05	-.07	-.08	-.15	-.08	-.12
To Misbehavior (by teacher)	-.03	-.05	-.05	-.19	.03	-.02	-.16	-.26	-.23	-.30	-.15	-.21
To Misbehavior (by students)	-.35	-.27	-.30	-.39	-.22	-.25	-.45	-.18	-.29	-.61	-.57	-.59

*Negative relationships indicate that as the teacher was rated as a better disciplinarian they also were judged to be less tolerant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 12

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND TEACHER TOLERANCE MEASURES

Measures of Tolerance	Demographic Variables											
	Age			Sex			Years Teaching			Locus of Control		
	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total
To Life Events (by spouse/ close friend)	-.03	-.22	-.16	.09	.10	.10	.13	.01	.05	.11	.36	.29
To Life Events (by teacher)	.04	-.10	-.04	.07	.19	.16	.06	.10	.10	.07	.09	.08
To Misbehavior (by teacher)	.03	.10	.08	-.24	-.30	-.27	-.15	.01	-.03	-.29	-.13	-.19
To Misbehavior (by students)	-.14	-.10	-.11	.27	.26	.26	.02	-.02	.01	-.27	.08	-.04

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 13

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND RATINGS OF DISCIPLINARY EFFECTIVENESS

Demographic Variables	Raters											
	Supervisor			Director			Teacher			Student		
	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total	School A	School B	Total
Age	.20	-.11	-.02	-.14	.06	.02	-.08	-.10	-.11	-.04	.00	-.04
Sex	-.24	-.05	-.12	-.10	-.18	-.15	-.02	.01	-.01	.03	-.03	-.02
Years of Teaching Experience	-.17	-.21	-.21	-.20	-.19	-.17	-.29	-.20	-.25	-.09	-.09	-.12
Locus of Control	.05	-.01	.02	.13	-.07	-.02	.26	-.07	.05	.18	-.17	-.04

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Butler, M. J. Discipline and the educational process: coping in the classroom. Washington, D. C.: Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 293).

Camp, W. G. Educator perceptions of student discipline. Boston, MA, April 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 676)

Camp, W. G. and Lawton, P., Jr. Student discipline: an analysis of teacher and administrator perceptions. Vancouver, British Columbia, June 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 971).

Caspair, I. E. Troublesome children in class. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Cruickshank, D. R. Teaching is tough. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1980.

Cruickshank, D. R. What we know about teachers' problems. Educational February 1981, 402-404.

Davis, J. E. Coping with disruptive behavior. Washington, D. C.: National Education Ass., 1974.

Gnagey, W. J. The psychology of discipline in the classroom. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1968.

Hargreaves, D. H., and Hester, S. K., and Mellor, F. J. Deviance in classrooms. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul Publishers, 1975.

Long, J. D., and Frye, V. H. Making it till Friday. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Book Company, 1977.

Martin, J. G. The tolerant personality. Wayne State University Press, 1964.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Tanner, L. N. Classroom discipline for effective teaching and learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.

Thompson, G. Discipline and the high school teacher. The Clearing House, May 1976, (49) 408-413.

Walker, H. M. The acting-out child: coping with classroom disruption. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Wickman, E. K. Children's behavior and teachers' attitudes. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

Wolfgang, C. H. and Glickman, C. D. Solving discipline problems. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE